

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 12, 2002. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending in this patent application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-20. Claims 1, 17 and 20 have been amended. Claims 13 and 16 have been cancelled. New Claims 21-22 have been added. Thus, Claims 1-12, 14-15 and 17-22 are now pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant has resubmitted the references which the Examiner has refused to consider with more precise date information. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of these references.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 17, 18 and 20 stand rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan, U.S. Patent No. 5,510,978 ("Colgan"), in view of Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,284 ("Brown"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and the assertions and determinations therein.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part, "determining whether a subscriber associated with the subscriber profile has access to the matched events based on a type associated with the profile." Applicant respectfully submits that no further search is needed with respect to amended Claim 1 as Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the elements of previously filed Claims 13 and 16. Neither Colgan nor Brown appear to teach or suggest these elements of amended Claim 1. In the Examiner's rejection of Claim 16, now cancelled, the Examiner relied upon a combination of Colgan, Brown, Langsenkamp and Hunt, and cites specifically only to Brown with respect to Claim 16. Office Action, p. 7, paragraph 18. Brown does not appear to teach these elements because once a police officer has been given access to the query form, Brown appears to make no further determinations as to whether the police officer has access to information after a match has been made. See Brown, col. 7, lines 11-25. Further, Brown does not appear to teach any differentiation between the access levels of subscribers based on a "subscriber profile" associated with the subscriber, as Brown merely teaches the use of a username and password for complete access to the database by a police officer. See Brown, col. 7, lines 11-25.

Thus, amended Claim 1 is patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Therefore, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited patents, either alone or in combination.

Amended Independent Claims 17 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that amended Claims 17 and 20 be allowed.

Claims 3-5 and 19 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan-Brown, and further in view of Langsenkamp et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,912,947 ("Langsenkamp"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and the assertions and determinations therein.

Dependent Claims 3-5 depend from independent Claim 1 and dependent Claim 19 depends from independent Claim 17. Claims 1 and 17 are shown above to be allowable. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 3-5 and 19 as dependent from an allowable base claim and as defining further distinctions over the cited patents, either alone, or in a proper combination.

Claims 6-16 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan-Brown-Langsenkamp, and further in view of Hunt et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,893,091 ("Hunt"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and the assertions and determinations therein.

More specifically, Claim 10 recites, "wherein the subscriber profile comprises a generic profile" and Claim 11 recites, "wherein the generic profile comprises a media generic profile." The Examiner cites to Brown as teaching these elements of Claims 10 and 11. Brown appears to provide no teaching or suggestion of particular types of profiles, nor any mention of a "media generic profile" or the media in general. See Brown, col. 7, line 7 – col. 8, line 49. Indeed, Brown appears to deal only with police officers and provides no teaching or suggestion of types of subscribers besides police officers. *Id.*

Dependent Claims 6-16 depend from independent Claim 1, shown above to be allowable. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claims 6-16 are allowable over Colgan-Brown-Langsenkamp-Hunt as depending from an allowable base claim and as including further distinctions over the cited patents, either alone, or in a proper combination.

New Claims

New dependent Claims 21-22 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 21-22 are patentable over any of Colgan, Brown, Langsenkamp and Hunt, either alone or in a proper combination. For example, Claim 21 recites, in part, "adding information from the related alert to the alert" and Claim 22 recites, in part, "expiring the public safety event based on a statute of limitations" which do not appear to be taught or suggested by any of Colgan, Brown, Langsenkamp and Hunt, either alone or in a proper combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new Claims 21-22.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-12, 14-15 and 17-22.

Although Applicant believes that no other fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this application, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call its attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant



Matthew B. Talpis  
Reg. No. 45,152

Correspondence Address:

Matthew B. Talpis, Esq.  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980  
Phone: 214-953-6984  
Fax: 214-661-4984

Date: 12-20-02



**MARKED UP VERSION OF CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

For the convenience of the Examiner, all claims have been listed whether or not an amendment has been made. The Claims have been amended as follows:

1. (Amended) A method for situation tracking comprising:  
receiving an alert at a clearing house; *- GEN ALERT AT MOBILE*  
handling a public safety event based on the alert; *(AT THE SERVER)*  
generating a notification in response to a subscriber profile and the event; [and]  
determining a destination for the notification based on the subscriber profile[.]; *- NOT IN IT*  
**comparing at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria associated with the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the emergency event;**  
**determining a match between the notify criteria and the emergency event based on the comparison; and**  
**determining whether a subscriber associated with the subscriber profile has access to the matched events based on a type associated with the profile.** *SUBSCRIBER*
2. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 1 further comprising determining a type associated with the alert at the clearing house and wherein the event comprises a type indication, a location indication, a time indication, a date indication, an access level and event details.
3. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 1, wherein the subscriber profile comprises a notify criteria, the notify criteria comprising a geographic distance around a first location indication, wherein the event comprises a second location indication and wherein generating a notification comprises determining whether the second location indication is within the geographic distance of the first location indication.
4. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 1 further comprising:  
associating at least one information need with the subscriber profile, the information need comprising at least one event related item of interest to the subscriber;  
comparing the information need to at least one of the events; and

determining at least one notification to be generated in response to a result associated with the comparison.

5. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 4, wherein the result comprises a selected event selected based on the comparison.

6. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 5, wherein generating the at least one notification comprises generating at least a portion of one web page based on the selected event and wherein the destination comprises a web site.

7. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 5, wherein generating the at least one notification comprises generating at least one electronic mail message based on the selected event and wherein the destination comprises an electronic mail address.

8. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 5, wherein comparing the information need comprises determining whether the subscriber is allowed to access the event.

9. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 1, wherein handling the event comprising:

updating the event when the alert is updating an existing event; and  
generating the event when the alert is associated with a new event.

10. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 1, wherein the subscriber profile comprises a generic profile.

11. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 10, wherein the generic profile comprises a media generic profile.

12. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 11, wherein generating the notification comprises:

comparing at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria associated with the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the emergency event;

INFO NEEDED C1.4

determining a match between the notify criteria and the emergency event based on the comparison; and

determining whether a media subscriber associated with the media generic profile has access to the matched events.

IN 1, SUBSCRIBER PROFILE

13. **(Cancelled)** The method for situation tracking according to Claim 1, wherein generating the notification comprises:

comparing at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria associated with the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the emergency event; and

determining a match between the notify criteria and the emergency event based on the comparison.

14. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 13, wherein the criteria element and the event element comprise a type associated with the event.

15. The method for situation tracking according to Claim 13, wherein the criteria element and the event element comprise a geographic location associated with the event.

16. **(Cancelled)** The method for situation tracking according to Claim 13 further comprising determining whether a subscriber associated with the subscriber profile has access to the matched events based on a type associated with the profile.

17. (Amended) A method for crime tracking comprising:  
generating an alert from a mobile device associated with a law enforcement vehicle;  
communicating the alert to a server;  
handling a crime event associated with the alert at the server; [and]  
generating a notification in response to a subscriber profile and the event[.];  
comparing at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria associated  
with the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the crime event;  
determining a match between the notify criteria and the crime event based on the  
comparison; and  
determining whether a subscriber associated with the subscriber profile has access  
to the matched events based on a type associated with the profile.

18. The method for crime tracking according to Claim 17, wherein the alert comprises a type indication, a location indication, a time indication, a date indication and a payload.

19. (Amended) The method for crime tracking according to Claim 17, [wherein generating the notification comprises:]  
[comparing at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria associated with the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the emergency event,] wherein the criteria element and the crime event element comprise a geographic location associated with the event[; and  
T-1P2  
determining a match between the notify criteria and the emergency event based on the comparison].



20. (Amended) A system for situation tracking comprising:  
a computer readable storage medium;  
an application stored in the computer readable storage medium and operable to:  
receive an alert at a clearing house;  
handling a public safety event based on the alert;  
generate a notification in response to a subscriber profile and the event; [and]  
determine a destination for the notification based on the subscriber profile[.];  
compare at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria  
associated with the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the event;  
determine a match between the notify criteria and the event based on the  
comparison; and  
determine whether a subscriber associated with the subscriber profile has  
access to the matched events based on a type associated with the profile.

-- Please add new claims 21-22:

21. (New) The method for situation tracking according to Claim 1 and further comprising:

inspecting the alert based on the criteria element at a server;

determining a related alert based on the criteria element, the related alert being related to the alert;

adding information from the related alert to the alert; and

forwarding the alert to the clearing house from the server.

22. (New) The method for situation tracking according to Claim 1 and further comprising expiring the public safety event based on a statue of limitations.

--